DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 561 TM 840 077

AUTHOR Lewy, Rafael
TITLE A Plan for School Personnel Evaluation Design.
INSTITUTION Salt Lake City School District, Utah.
PUB DATE Jan 84
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Salt Lake City School District, 440E, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 ($1.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Responsibility; Affective Behavior; Communication Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Lesson Plans; Occupational Tests; Peer Evaluation; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teaching Skills; Time on Task

ABSTRACT

The development of an evaluation schema for school personnel must be based on the following stipulations: time, adequate financing, and external validation of techniques and methodologies. In planning an evaluation program, three questions dominate the scene throughout the literature. First, what shall be evaluated? Possible variables which can be evaluated include teacher background and organizational skills, communication ability, classroom product in the form of student achievement, ability to instigate meaningful and focused work in the classroom, and use of those affective components which reinforce teaching effectiveness. In the light of present knowledge, the evaluator should resort to a holistic method, rather than dissecting these variables into small components. Second, how and when can these variables be evaluated? The first phase of teacher evaluation must occur before entry into the profession. The evaluation of professional teachers should include the establishment of objectives, the choice of methods for assessing objectives, and the adaptation of evaluation time frames. Third, who should evaluate teachers? Some possibilities include school administrators, other teachers, the teacher being evaluated (self-evaluation), and students and parents. Further recommendations for evaluation planning are made. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241561

A PLAN FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL EVALUATION DESIGN

By Rafael Lewy

In the beginning it is important to remember Stufflebeam's admonition to evaluation planners: The institutionalization of an evaluation plan should be designed exclusively to assist some audience to judge and improve the worth of some educational object. And conversely, in spite of its popularity, especially among lay audiences, which have the power to bring to bear great political pressures to expedite the creation of evaluation mechanisms, great care should be taken not to enforce and implement evaluation policies before the needed technology is developed and field tested.[1] In the same article, the authors identify thirteen different approaches to evaluation, some unacceptable, and others promising, with the distinct intention to alert the reader to the fact that no single evaluation model has yet been identified as being distinctly superior over others. The field is wide open, and the good evaluation plan is one which fits the specific needs of time and place.

The development of an evaluation schema for school personnel must, therefore, be based on the following stipulations:

1) Time - The development of any meaningful personnel evaluation plan, in the absence of universals, from the planning to the implementation stages, is a process whose estimated duration, according to known precedences, is a two to three year concerted effort.[2]

2) Adequate financing - The planning and implementation of an evaluation plan requires research personnel, especially at the local levels, implementation personnel and tools of the trade, such as computor services, means of communication and

---

1) Daniel L. Stufflebeam and William J. Webster, "An Analysis of Alternative Approaches to Evaluation, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, May-June 1980 pp. 5-21

2) *Dade County Public Schools, Bureau of Staff Development, "Teacher Assessment and Development System (TADS)", Letter to Dr. Lewy, November 16, 1983*

Russel S. Beeher, "Staff Evaluation: The Essential Administrative Task", Phi Delta Kappan, March 1979, 515-17

Bagford, Jack, "Evaluating Teachers on Reading Instruction", Reading Teachers, Jan 1981 pp. 400-04

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Lewy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu

information exchange, etc. This does not come cheap, because it cannot be absorbed by the regular school structure, which is not fitted organizationally to undertake a meaningful evaluation responsibility within the limitations of its present constraints. It must be understood that effective personnel evaluation will increase administrative roles, will require specific inservice preparations, and will demand large quantities of paid released time.[3]

3) External Validation of techniques and methodologies.[4]

With these stipulations in mind, it can be stated unambigously that a system of personnel evaluation is not only possible, but within reach. The negative attitudes this idea illicits in some circles emanates from misapplications, abuses and a complete absence of incentives to institute it. The evaluation has been viewed by many as a control device "a process of collecting and analysing information about past activities and events in order to plan and control future activities and events"[5]

In the absence of rewarding responses to favorable evaluation results in education, the idea of control assumed a repugnant

---

3) Crews, Carol "Rush to Judgement, No Time for Teacher Evaluation? Make Time" NASSP Bulletin, Feb 1981, pp. 12-16

AASA Critical Issues Report, Staff Dismissal, American Association of School Administrators, 1978, p. 25

Strather, Marlene, "Accountability in the Classroom: How Teachers Evaluate" NASSP Bulletin, Mar 1980, pp. 16-20

Haertel Geneva and Harriet Talmage "Parents, Teachers and Evaluators: A Partnership to Enhance Home and School Learning Environments" Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, San Francisco 1979

4) Most of the elaborate evaluation schemas have been developed independently of the intended educational product, the reason being that their conceptualizers came mostly from outside the school systems, and for a variety of reasons rarely delivered an authoritative, validated and accessible evaluation tool.

Instead, the field is inundated with models, paradigms, instruments and benevolent advice. The gap between these and the daily concerns of the educational practitioner has only begun to be noticed: See for example: Lloyd E. McCleary, "Administrator Evaluation: Concerns for the Practitioner" in Elio Zappulla Evaluating Administrative Performance:Current Trends and Techniques, Star Publishing Company, 1983

5) Robert C. Hawley, "Assessing Teacher Performance" Education Research Associates, Amherst, Mass. 1982, p. 9

connotation because it meant to many, particularly the organized teacher community, an attempt to assume greater organizational control, at the expense of professional freedom, through punitive action. This perception has been and still is reinforced by historical memories which revive the picture of a depressed and suppressed profession arising from the status of semi-serfdom through a salary schedule based on professional preparation and longevity in the profession. A correct application of evaluative techniques has never been part of the preparation provided for school professionals. By the same token, field conditions never ripened for their correct application. The obstacles confronting evaluation planners are of a psychological nature which can be overcome through close cooperation of all interested parties.

In planning an evaluation program, three questions dominate the scene throughout the literature:

1) What shall be evaluated?
2) How and when can it be evaluated?
3) Who shall evaluate?

WHAT SHALL BE EVALUATED?

Professional literature is not in agreement even on the basic elements of teacher evaluation. The most basic questions such as 'should elementary and secondary teachers be evaluated on the same standards?' or 'should product evaluation take precedence over process evaluation' and hence 'should achievement scores of students be included in the evaluation schema' are still controversial items in the professional literature.[6]

---

6) See for example: Ken Peterson and Don Kauchack "Progress on Development of Lines of Evidence for the Evaluation of Public School Teaching" Paper Presented at the American Research Association, Montreal, April 1983. The Authors postulate a highly individualized evaluation model which is free of a specific standard set of criteria.

Dade County TADS, Ibid. Relies on seven categories applicable to all teachers at all levels of instruction.

Coker, Joan & Homer, Classroom Observations Keyed for Effecto veness Research, Georgia State University, 1982. This system is addressed to general teaching competencies and products.

Hatti, John et al. "Student Teacher Performance by Supervising Teachers" Journal of Educational Psychology, Oct 1982 pp. 778-85, describe findings indicating distinct differences in teaching performance at elementary and secondary levels.

Robert A. Martin, "Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques for Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture", Pennsylvania State University, Sept 30, 1980. Unpublished paper. Discusses the controversy of product versus process supervision (in this case the author makes no distinction between supervision and evaluation).

But the most crucial dilemma in addressing what should be evaluated, is the question of validity, which alludes to the problem whether and to what degree do variables associated with good teaching predict successful learning outcomes. One of the best comments based on research about this problem is contained in the following quotation:

> The task of measuring competencies and relating such measures to student learning variables is a formidable one, not only because of the effort involved in obtaining data, but also because of the measurement problems encountered. Research results about effects are far from conclusive. It is fair to say that measurement and research in this area are in their infancy. The approach of establishing criterion validity could be through establising the correlation between performance competancy and student learning using the classroom as the unit analysis. This approach requires a very large data base and involves numerous variables. Although a number of such analyses are underway, it will be some time before substantial numbers are completed.[7]

The beginnings of teacher evaluation, therefore, must rely on variables which have been generally regarded by researchers and practitioners as important to educational outcomes. These data must undergo continous scrutinity and refinement as additional information based on empirical research becomes available. Until such time, the debate of process versus product is moot. With the tools and techniques available, one must embrace the assumption that certain processes lead toward certain outcomes. Failing to do so, one challenges the totality of educational theory. Hence evaluation methodology must take into account both processes and outcomes. Planning an evaluation plan from this premise, the following competencies, products and processes should be the base for developing evaluation schemas:

1) Preparation and organization

Most evaluation plans, and to a degree some empirical evidence, point to the fact that the preparatory work performed by teachers, their organizational qualities and planning ability have a crucial impact on the quality of instruction. Lambeth (1981) shows a statistical correlation between interpersonal contact, course organization learning environment caring and respect -- all attributes of effective teachers as shown in numerous studies.[8]

---

7) Coker, Joan and Homer, Ibid. p. 14

8) Lambeth, C. R. "Teacher Invitations and Effectiveness" Paper Presented to the American Educational Research Association, Ca. 1981

Smith and others (1981) showed that students instructed in geometry achieved significantly higher grades when lessons were structured.[9] Similar conclusions were reached from science instruction by the same researchers. Denton and others (1982) measuring 28 instructional skills of student teachers only found one which is significantly related to achievement outcome -- lesson plan development.[10] Chapman and Hutchinson (1982) comparing a group of teachers remaining in the profession to another which dropped out of the profession observed that the practicing teachers viewed themselves superior on organizational skills (developing new approaches, planning and organizing activities) to their colleagues who dropped out of the profession.[11]

Organizational skills have been included in virtually every teacher assessment instrument or research relating to teacher effectiveness.[12]

---

9) Lyle Smith and others "A Low Inference Indicator of Lesson Structure in Mathematics" ERIC ED 207856, 1981

10) Denton Jon et al "Relations Among Final Supervisors' Skill Rating of Student Teachers and Cognitive Attainment Values of Learners Taught by Student Teachers" Paper Presented at Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin Feb 11-12, 1982

11) Chapman, David and Sigrid Hutchison "Attrition for Teaching Careers: A Discriminant Analysis" American Educational Research Journal"

12) The literature on this subject is literally inexhaustible. The following are merely reference samples:

Hattie, John et al, Ibid.
Bagford, Jack Ibid
Boris, Blai "Faculty Perceptions of Effective Teachers: A Parallel Perceptions Inquiry". *Harcum Junior College, PA 1982*
Harcum Junior College, PA 1982
Gray J. et al, "Formal or Informal? Reassessment of the British Evidence", British Journal of Educational Psychology, June 1981 pp. 187-96
Natriello Gary, "The Impact of the Evaluation of Teaching on Teacher Effort and Effectiveness, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, N.Y. March 1982

Frederick H. Genk and Allen Klingberg, Effective Schools Through Effective Management, Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978

John P. Sullivan Kovalski, Evaluating Teacher Performance, Educational Research Service Inc. 1979

Larry A. Braskamp "What Research Says About Teaching" in Observation and the Evaluation of Teaching, Phi Delta Kappa, Willard Duckett (Ed) 1980

D. Bolton, "The Bases for Evaluating Teaching: Philosophy, Context and Purpose" in Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching, Gephart et al (Eds), Phi Delta Kappa, 1979

2) Communication

The difficulty in isolating individual concepts for evaluation is associated with the fact that educational literture has not produced a uniformity of definitions. Thus, for example, some researchers incorporate communication into the organizational aspect of instruction. Most researchers and observers, however, regard communication, or involvement, as a major component of the instructional process, and empirical evidence justifies its treatment as a discrete and important element.

The concept "communication" in itself offers technical difficulties, because of its loose interpretations. Weller (1982) defines it as an organized delivery system (hence the confusion with organizational skills).[13]

Goldstein (1982) refers to it from the point of view of teacher communication skills, the ability to convey concepts through the facility of oral and written usage of the English language.[14]

Blackmer (1981) regards communications in the pychological sense, namely maintaining positive interpersonal relations.[15]

Likewise, communication skills are included in most major teacher evaluation instruments.[16]

Another more comprehensive interpretation of teacher communication is described by Goodlad (1984) as student involvement, which can be conceptualized as a kind of total emersion in an ongoing communication web, taking a variety of forms.[17]

---

13) David Weller, "Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: A "PERSONALIZED" Approach to Staff Development", Paper Presented at the National Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Phoenix, AZ, Feb 1982

14) William Goldstein, Supervision Made Simple, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, fastback, Bloomington, Ind. 1982

15) Dianne Blackmer, and others, "School Improvement Model Teacher Performance Criteria With Response, Modes and Standards. A Report", Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Aimes, Ia 1981

16) See for Example ERS Report, Evaluating Teacher Performance, Ibid.

17) John I. Goodlad, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw Hill, 1984, pp. 101-105. Goodlad did not quantify his observations, which, from an orthodox research point of view, would be challenged. However, by resorting to the descriptive method, he conveys to the reader a new way to understand the term "communication" in a way which has not yet been translated into empirical research methodology.

The work on communication, in a sense, is a researcher's paradise. But the evaluation process cannot be held up until universals are empirically derived.

The communication aspect of teaching is synonimous to the teaching function itself. Therefore it is imperative to begin evaluative work in this area on an ad hoc basis subject to refinement and improvement as knowledge and understanding progress.

3) Achievement

The measurement of achievement as an evaluation component is one of the most controversial issues in evaluation literature.[18] Again, the arguments center mainly on the lack of empirical evidence about teaching components which have an effect on academic achievement. But academic achievement is one of the main components of an evaluation plan. As with all other evaluation components, the technology of measurement is a most annoying problem in the correct assessment of achievement. But this strengthens rather than weakens the argument in favor of including achievement in the evaluation design, even at the risk of measurement errors, as long as there are mechaniams to correct them. Achievement, particularly academic achievement, is deeply impregnated in the public's mind. The argument that it is being abused does not prevent its use as a powerful tool to influence public opinion. As a matter of fact, continuous achievement assessments of dubious quality have been a powerful factor in the creation of a low public education image. No argument of technical nature about achievement measurement will gain credibility. On the other hand, a controlled and self-correcting process of handling and interpreting achievement data will not only enrich qualitative knowledge, but also lead to the discovery of the parameters within which it can be assessed.

Therefore, in spite of Soar, Medley and Coker's criticism[19] school

---

18) See for example Peterson et al, Ibid

19) Ibid. These researchers are just few of many objecting to the use of achievement product data in an evaluation design as long as basic methodology problems have not been solved.

districts should reassess their testing programs, which, in many cases, have been institutionalized for decades, in the light of new evaluation needs. Furthermore, intensive efforts should be made to establish more sophisticated baselines for comparison purposes, and above all, a positive and constructive public education endeavor must be undertaken with the objective to teach lay publics to interpret these data realistically.

With this in mind, what can be assessed as achievement predictors? In the last decade there is a growing body of knowledge which relates mastery of teaching techniques and knowledge to significant gains in learning. History of education began with an almost exclusive emphasis on what to teach. Then came a period, especially in the thirties and forties, of growing belief that the knowledge of how to teach took precedence over the knowledge of what to teach. Most educators agree today that mastery of subject matter and the ability to impart it effectively are merely two sides of the same coin. Insofar as knowledge of the content area does not seem to be significant predictor of teaching success,[20] the data may be a statistic artifact, because of the small variance between students of education on subject matter. The same has been brought up by other researchers who observed a rather narrow variance on academic achievement of teaching aspirants who generally converge around the lowest 20% achievement levels.[21]

The relationship between teachers' preparation in both education and general fields of knowledge and student attainment, has been belabored, and, to a degree established, by Denton and his associates. (1979, 1980, 1981)[22]

---

20) Hattie John et al. "Student Teachers' Performance" Ibid.

21) Phillip Schlechty and Victor Vance, Research on Teaching Implication for Practice, Recruitment Selection and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force, U.S. Department of Education, A National Invitational Conference, Feb 25-27, 1982

22) Jon Denton and Sherrill Norris, "Cognitive Attainment of Learners of Student Teachers: A Criterion for Attaining an Accountable Teacher Preparation Program", Texas A&M University 1979

Jon Denton et al, "An Evaluation Design to Examine the Instructional Effects of Classroom Teachers" Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Sep-Oct 1980, pp. 5-17

Denton, Jon et al, Academic Characteristics of Student Teachers and Cognitive Attainment of their Learners" Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Dallas, Feb 17, 1981

These researchers, notwithstanding modifications of their findings in the form of prior knowledge of learners and other baseline data, established that the better a student teacher is prepared in professional and subject matter knowledge, the more his students learn. These findings, which admittedly must be expanded and refined, already produce implications on assessment processes which can be used to evaluate teachers without delay. The amount and quality of professional and subject matter preparation should be evaluated at the entrance levels as well as in periodic evaluation activities. Further elaboration on this theme will be undertaken in the section which deals with the applicative phases and forms of teacher evaluation.

4) Time on Task

In the absence of an authoritative factor analysis of the entire teaching task, some overlaps in the general descriptive areas of what should be evaluated cannot be avoided. In recent years, more and more attention has been devoted to the amount of time learners spend on their learning. Naturally, the time on task principle is intrinsically related to organization, communication and professional mastery. However, educators have rediscovered its overwhelming impact on the product, and it deserves a special place in any teacher evaluation design. Furthermore, it subsumes the discipline factor, which has been insulated from the entire educational process primarily in literature written for and by non-educators. Discipline must be viewed as a distractor from the time-on-task activities. Methodologically it can be assumed that a classroom which shows learning productivity (time-on-task) will have few discipline problems and vice versa.

Braskamp (1980), in his survey of research on effective teaching, concludes that teaching as identified by empirical work really must follow two directions: 1) competence 2) concern.[23] There is some analogy between these conclusions and Hatties concept of "Preparation and Presentation".[24] Organization, communication and achievement variables are more closely associated with competence or preparation. The time on task variable, as defined in literature,

---

23) Braskamp, Ibid. p. 83

24) Hattie et al. Ibid, pp. 778-85

includes more "caring" components. Keeping students on task is not to be construed as a task-master's performance. True, there is "competence" related to the ability of the teacher to keep students negotiating learning tasks reflecting objectives,[25] but in a broader sense, researchers are not merely looking for the formality of negotiating relevant content, but for an active on task interaction between teacher and student.[26] Goodlad puts it very succinctly when he says: "of course we cannot equate time on instruction with the quality of instruction".[28] From this point of view, most measuring devices, particularly check lists, are in error by equating quantity to quality, or substituting competency elements for caring elements in dealing with the "time on task" component. "Time-on-task" is perhaps one of the most difficult components to measure. It must be included in the teacher evaluation schema, but hard work has to precede at the local and other levels, to reach measurable and acceptable operational definitions which can be used in an evaluation plan.

5) Affective Components

The affective domains of teaching can only be considered worthy to be included in an evaluation plan if there is a reasonable basis to assume that they have a positive effect on learning outcomes. From this point of view, affective issues are the peak of the controversy of personnel evaluation. Nothing in research literature throws light on the question why and how do affective components in the teaching situation contribute to increased learning. The ensuing confusion has strewn various aspects of "caring" or "concern" across evaluation instruments in a most capricious and arbitrary way, reflecting a variety of ideologies rather than defensible concepts lifted from valid and accepted theories of learning. These elements of "concern" reflect anything from hand holding to blind acceptance

25) Beecher, Ibid. p. 517, This author represents a large number of educators and researchers whose approach to the time-on-task element is rigid. Methodologically, measurement or observations used to determine the existence of this trait in an instructional situation is formal. Such an approach serves the goal of controlling rather than evaluating.

26) Jane Stallings et al. "How to Change the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools" Department of Health, Education and Welfare, May 1979. Although this author only addresses a very limited situation, her approach reflects the more sophisticated approach to time-on-task, emphasizing active interaction versus passive time-on-task activities, such as silent reading. Here the human element plays a significant role.

27) Goodlad, Ibid. p. 99

of the vagaries of immaturity.

An illustration of the aforesaid can be sought from the work of Flately (1980)[28] and Allen (1979).[29] Both researchers, in their specific fields of investigation, found that some affective aspects of education which are generally believed to have a positive effect on learning, had no, or even negative effects, on learning outcomes. Allen found that teacher enthusiasm as measured on eight variables, eye movement, vocal delivery, gestures, body movement, facial expression, word selection, acceptance of ideas and feelings and overall energy level had no influence on attendance or interest. Achievement of learners was almost independent of enthusiasm levels of their teachers. Flately found that interpersonal relations skills components of teachers (empathy, congruence, positive regard) were negatively related to learning and performance outcomes in an office skills class. True, these examples are not conclusive. They can be challenged on the grounds of research methodology. The findings, if correct, only apply to extremely specific situations. But with all their shortcomings, they warn against excessive use of the affective domain as independent evaluation variables in the present state of knowledge on this specific subject.

In summary, in the development of an evaluation schema for teachers, work should be based on a far smaller number of criteria than is generally believed. Furthermore, efforts to dissect evaluation variables into small components may be counter productive. In the light of present knowledge, the evaluator should resort to a holistic method. The inherent calculated risk in this approach is still superior to lengthy overly detailed evaluation approaches, which are administratively cumbersome and presumptuous.[30]

---

28) Edward Allen, "A Study of the Relationship of Teacher Enthusiasm to Salient Selected Variables Influencing Achievement in the Vocational Laboratory", Temple University, Penn. Dec 14, 1979

29) Flately, Mary, "Do Better Teachers Have Better Interpersonal Skills" Business Education Forum, Oct 1980, 11-12

30) M. Donald Thomas identifies 10 basic variables as a basis for a teacher evaluation plan: Classroom management, teacher-student relationship, professional attitude, preparation and planning, knowledge of subject matter, public relations, techniques of instruction, pupil adjustment, pupil evaluation, health and appearance. See: M. Donald Thomas "Performance Evaluation" in Zappula (Ed.), Evaluating Administrative Performance, etc., Ibid p. 64

Boris Blai "Faculty Perceptions of Effective Teachers: A Parallel-Perceptions Inquiry", Harcum College, PA 1982, identifies fourteen basic components of effective teaching.

HOW AND WHEN TO EVALUATE

There are two basic approaches to teacher evaluation. The first is extremely negative based on the correct observation that all existing methods of evaluation are inadequate, and that no method should be introduced until it is empirically tested and verified.[31] The second approach leans in the opposite direction. According to it, evaluation is an integral part of an accountability system a public service owes the publics which support it, for two reasons: a) measuring the quality of its services so that they can be improved b) convincing the tax paying patron that his/her sacrifice is justified.[32] Behind these positions which are indisputable, for they contain elements of truth, one must assume a political hidden curriculum, as is the case when rhetoric is ferocious. It is true that a technology for a comprehensive evaluation design based on empiricism is not yet available. It is also true that the profession owes itself and the publics it serves an ongoing evaluation process. As a matter of fact this process has been carried out in 97.9% of American schools,[33] mostly resorting to strategies which are difficult to defend. These practices have existed for many years without a challenge. Why there should be discontent, when for the first time in educational history there is a demand to professionalize the evaluation process, is difficult to explain. In reality the evaluation expectation is not a demand to introduce a new element into the school system, but to improve old practices, which should be improved. And anything, even systematic planning and analytical thinking, without the necessary technology, is an improvement.

The first phase of teacher evaluation must occur before entry into the profession. The poor quality of preparation is well documented. Allowing professionals of poor quality to embark on a teaching

---

31) Soar, Medley and Coker, Phi Delta Kappan, Ibid. pp. 239-46

32) Garawski, Robert, "Successful Teacher Evaluation Not A Myth", NASSP Bulletin March 1980, pp. 1-7

Robert Hawley, Assessing Teacher Performance, p. 1

These two references are mere samples of a whole body of literature representing one view or the other.

33) ERS Report, Evaluating Teacher Performance, Ibid. p. vi

career first and evaluating them later reduces the entire effort of meaningful teacher evaluation to mockery.[34] The methods and instruments used to screen out those who should not be granted access to the profession are still much in doubt. But every aspiring teacher should be required to pass a competency examination before being certified, not unlike lawyers and doctors. Such examination by no means eliminates all incompetents. But these arguments can be used in any profession. How else can we explain the existence of some incompetent lawyers and physicians. One must, however, assume that competency examination, before entrance into the profession, will reduce the quantity and quality of professional incompetence to a degree that will render any subsequent evaluation efforts meaningful.

A professional entrance examination must be addressed to three basic areas: 1) knowledge of pedagogy 2) mastery of basic skills 3) mastery of specialization. The basic skills and pedagogy areas may, to a degree, overlap. The specialization examination will be different for different groups of teachers. The need for such tests is documented by observations which disparage the blind trust vested in the product of schools of education and schools of the liberal arts.[35] The question that needs be resolved is whether the entrance examination should be entrusted to instruments of a national agency or reflect the preferences of state and local levels. On the basis of contemporary observations, it is believed that the readiness for a national teacher competency examination has not been established at this point.[36]

---

34) Schlechty and Vance Ibid. pp. 25-27 report that the academic proficiency of aspirant teachers has declined towards the bottom compared to aspirants in other professions. These findings have been confirmed only recently: Education Daily Nov 18, 1983 p. 4

35) Criticism of colleges of education in regard to their product is old. As a matter of fact, until recently they have been allowed to carry the brunt of the blame. But approximately 75% of a teacher's preparation is given in schools of liberal arts, whose poor work has not been noticed in conjunction with teacher quality until recently. See for example Education Daily, Ibid. and Cindy Tursman, Good Teachers: What to Look for, National School Public Relations Association 1981, pp. 86-87

36) Soar Medley and Coker Ibid. p. 241 Criticize The National Teacher Examination because of its unpredictability, emphasis on minimum competencies and lack of validity. The NTE is one of the more popular entrance tools. This criticism is based on the old version of the test. A revised version has already come out and deserves serious scrutiny. See Education Daily, Nov 23, 1983 pp. 1-2. Many states, like Florida, have their own instruments. See Lutz, J.P. et al, "Looking Forward By Looking Backward", Phi Delta Kappan, Feb 1983 pp. 430-432. Reports like these, on state administered examinations reflect positive experiences and should be looked into.

It would be the responsibility of the State and/or local school districts to devise a testing strategy which, relying on the three basic areas mentioned earlier, would determine a candidate's acceptance into the profession. The form of such a test should be of a multiple nature, in order, in the absence of empirical knowledge, to take into account as many of the variables believed to be associated with successful teaching until future research makes abbreviations possible. The entrance examination should be taken at any point a candidate is ready during, but not later than two years of probationary instruction. A committee of scholars, practicing educators and public representatives should review and update the test periodically, associating content to state and local goals of education. In part the test should be in written form, and in part be based on the observations of trained observers.[37]

Whereas entrance requirements must be established authoritatively, because they reflect the best knowledge about educational experience and expectations, the evaluation of professional teachers poses quite a different problem. It must be recognized that the object of evaluation are seasoned and certificated professionals. An evaluation therefore, at this stage, does not deal with the question whether a teacher should remain a member of his/her profession (unless in question is a matter of impropriety for which other means should be available), but how well is a professional service performed. Recognizing this distinction, Educational Testing Service has taken most drastic steps to prevent school authorities from using the NTE, which is a screening device, as an evaluation instrument.[38]

Most authorities agree that teacher evaluation projects should be established in coordination with and participation of the teaching profession. This principle has even been accepted by the State of

---

37) Since empirical evidence on this preliminary teacher testing procedure is not available, this section has been written as a synthesis of many fragmentary statements in the literature which are based on belief and common sense rather than controlled experience. The State of Utah will have to blaze its own trail relying on the best human judgement available.

38) Education Daily, Nov 18, 1983, Ibid

Connecticut, one of the few which have legislated teacher evaluation into law.[39] Teachers should participate in the evaluation plan from its inception, e.g. the planning stages.[40] This position is most strongly supported by those believing in performance based evaluation, namely, an evaluation plan closely associated with local educational objectives where an individual's contribution towards the attainment of the objective is negotiated individually.[41]

The task of establishing objectives is the first step in an evaluation plan. A good plan is positively related to the clarity of the objectives. Literature warns against adopting the objectives of others, not to mention the methods of measuring them. The question of who establishes objectives will be discussed later, the problem of measuring their attainment after they have been clearly established is the concern of this section. Notwithstanding numerous statements on the subject, measurement is limited by time constraints, financial considerations and the very nature of the process of schooling, which may conflict with excessive evaluation zeal. The major obstacle of an evaluation program is the selection of assessment tools and methods, namely making decisions what to leave out, which is infinitely more than what is possible to include in the evaluation schema.

The literature abounds with evaluation devices, which fall, generally speaking, into two major categories. a) observational strategies b) post factum written reports. The first include check lists which

---

39) State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut, "Connecticut's Evaluation Law - Teacher Evaluation in Connecticut", in Zappulla, Ibid. pp. 133-7

40) Haertel et al. Ibid. Robert F. Mager, Goal Analysis, Pearnon Publishers, Ca. 1972 William Gephart "Components of a Humane System for Evaluating Teaching" in Observation and the Evaluation of Teaching, Ibid. pp. 121-123
Salt Lake City School District, "Basic Policies", in Zappulla, Ibid. pp. 165-72

41) Bolton Dale, Ibid. "Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching, Guidelines and Principles" Phi Delta Kappa, Monograph, 1979, p. 35-36

McGreal Thomas, "Developing a Teacher Evaluation System: Communalities of those Systems that Function Most Effectively", Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Curriculum and Supervision, CA 1982

The references used in footnotes 39, 40, 41, are mere samples of a large body of literature which is speculative in nature and lacks empirical proof.

are filled out during an observation,[42] the others are many forms of reporting on various aspects of teaching after the teaching act has taken place.[43] A major admonition of those who have given professional thought to the selection of evaluation method is to beware of "borrowing" tools.[44] The diversity of schooling compells individual districts, and sometimes even schools, to create their own measuring devices, at least in areas in which they are unique. This applies to the measuring of baselines (background variables) and specific goals. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the main objective of all schools is to teach, and teaching has its universals. These universals can be measured by tools which have been either made available commercially or others which have been empirically tested. From this point of view, three types of measuring instruments should be chosen: a) instruments measuring teaching universals b) instruments measuring local conditions c) instruments measuring specific preferences established by local boards of education.

The planning phase for an evaluation program should be devided into goal setting activities and method setting activities. The first, is a collaborative effort of professionals and the community.[45] The second, which deals with how to assess these objectives, is a technical function which should be performed by professional staffs after training and preparation. These staffs should consist of administrators, evaluators and teachers.

---

42) One of the best known observation scales is the Flanders. See Flanders Ned A., Analysing Teaching Behavior, Reading Mass. Addison Wesley Publishing Co. 1970

43) The number of such evaluation instruments which have been prepared for a variety of evaluators (professionals, peers, students, etc.) is endless. See for example ERS Report Evaluating Teacher Performance, Ibid, Robert C. Hawley, Evaluating Teaching: A Handbook of Positive Approaches, ERA, Education Research Associates, 1982.

44) On this point there is almost universal agreement of all leading authorities. The essence of evaluation is complete harmony with the goals of the organization, which differ from plane to place. This principle is most ostensibly pronounced in the writings which promulgate a performance based evaluation plan. For a broadly based illustration of this principle see: Casteter William, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration, second edition, MacMillan Publishing Company 1976. See also Cindy Tursman, Good Teachers, etc., Ibid. Ch. II

45) An example for such collaboration was set in Minnesota and Iowa, See: Walker R. Scott, "The School Improvement Model: Tailoring A Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation System to Meet the Needs of the School Organization", Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn. 1982

One falacy in personnel evaluation is the adage that evaluation time frames can and should be adapted to the limitations of a school year. Such practices are almost universally accepted. As a result, the evaluation function is compressed into a time strait jacket not unlike the nine month school year. If the premise that learning is an accumulative activity which has plateaus and even regressions is allowed, the same must be assumed about teaching. A personnel evaluaplan which assumes continual and uninterupted learning growth which can be perceived and measured within time frames of eight months (the time interval between pre and post tests), confines the entire schema to a controlling activity, as feared by many.[46]

The third step, then, after the adaptations of clearly defined goals and the setting of evaluation methodologies and instruments, many of which must be locally devised, is the adaptation of evaluation time frames. These decisions must be based on desregard of the length of the school year and concentrate instead on when and how can the best representative sample of a teacher instruction behavior be documented. Some researchers suggest to use formative and summative evaluation strategies in tandem. Formative evaluation strategies can be interpreted as behavior sampling experiments until evaluators are satisfied. Summative evaluation is the final judgemental statement based on the formative efforts and other information as deemed necessary.[47]

Whereas the formative efforts may take from one to three years (the shorter the time, the more varied the behavior sample must be), the summative statement, according to some authorities should be made once every three years.[48] In essence, the power of evaluation is in its feedback and communication which have been proven to be effective in the improvement of teacher morale and work. Teachers, like other

---

46) Carolyn J. Wood and Paul A. Pahland, "Teacher Evaluation: The Myth and Realities", in Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching, Ibid. p. 81

47) Larry W. Barber and Karen Klein, "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation" Phi Delta Kappan Dec 1983, pp. 247-251. The authors conceptualize formative evaluation as process evaluation, which is the traditional interpretation. However, formative evaluation per se does not exclude the product as a tentative statistic or item of information subject to review and adjustment.

48) Ibid. Natriello Gary "The Impact of Teaching on Teacher Effort and Effectiveness", Paper Presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, New York, March 1982. It is suggested that frequent evaluation and feed back (formative) increases teacher morale and effectiveness.

professionals, expect their work to be noticed, and they take a positive attitude towards evaluation if convinced that it is done professionally.

For this purpose an additional component must be introduced. Most professionals who evaluate teachers have not been trained for that function. The results, therefore, seem amateurish and capricious. For example, most universities in their programs of educational administration, do not prepare future administrators to evaluate teachers. In sharp contradiction to this fact, literature says that teacher evaluation is one of the important functions of the principal. Unless means are provided to prepare trained evaluators in each school district the present impetus will again fail to surge above the point of rhetoric.

Up to this point, the quality of teaching was the center point of an evaluation system which envisions improvement in instructional quality and quantity, using the merit principle as an added dimension to reinforce success -- a contrast to time honored practices which, for all practises and purposes, respond only to unsatisfactory performance. From this point of view alone, merit pay is not only possible but imperative.

Whether three or four teaching phases are introduced as a result of a renewed approach to personnel evaluation is subject to negotiations at the local level. A final word on this subject is in order about the category, which some call "master teacher". A master teacher, as perceived by some, is a professional who provides leadership to others in two fields -- curriculum development and instructional development. Whereas the elevation from one category to another at the lower levels should be based on an assessment of teaching success, the master teacher level demands an additional dimension, which has not been discussed in the literature. To hold such a position, a teacher must not only be effective in instruction and related skills, but master a significant repertory of teaching styles, subject matter, and above all, have the ability to impart these to his/her colleagues. No instrument or cogent knowledge/experience is described in the literature to help identify professionals suitable for this category. Should the master teacher position become

an integral part of a "new order", work on the identification processes of professionals suiting the bill must begin immediately with the understanding that the profession is sailing in uncharted waters.

WHO EVALUATES?

In the conventional setting, teacher evaluation is considered an administrative responsibility, which is mostly performed by the principal himself. This principle is primarily set for the elementary school. As a matter of fact, the principal is encouraged to visit classrooms frequently, and in one case, devote as much as three days per year to each teacher in classroom visitations and conferences.[50] A second approach is to rely on a supervisor. By implication it is understood that a supervisor is specially trained to evaluate teaching and provide remedial teaching programs whenever necessary.[51] This presumes the presence of a large administrative staff for the sole purpose of evaluating and training teachers at all levels. Although very idealistic, such an approach is fiscally out of reach. Still surveys still show a strong support for evaluation by supervisors.[52]

Peer evaluation is a plan which is brought up with increasing frequency. It has existed in some school systems for many years. Mostly, this system was used when new teachers had to be "broken in".[53] The Salt Lake City School District uses teachers to assist in situations where summative decisions must be reached and could be fatal

---

50) Crews, Carol "Rush to Judgement, No Time for Teacher Evaluation? Make Time" NASSP Bulletin, Feb 1981, 12-16

Barber and Klein Ibid. regard the summative evaluation function as an administrative task to keep the board informed.

Mary Gleason, Teacher Supervision: Helping Principals Apply the School and Classroom Effectiveness Findings, OSSC Bulletin, March 1983

These are just a few samples of a vast body of literature written in the same vein.

51) Joseph Ferreira, "The Role of the Supervisor in Teacher Evaluation" Phi Delta Kappan, May 1981 pp. 671-2

52) ERS Bulletin, April 1982

53) Education Week "Teachers Evaluate Teachers in Unusual Project in Toledo" October 27, 1982

to some teaching careers.[54] The reaction to peer evaluation is mixed. It is praised on political grounds and by the same token it is also criticized on political grounds. As a general observation, peer evaluation is still in its infancy and must be utilized much more extensively before final judgement is reached.

But the basic element in peer evaluation as in other forms of teacher participation in the evaluation process is an emergent principle, which emanates from ongoing research on this subject. Teacher's satisfaction from and support of evaluation depends on their feeling of having some control over it, rather than being subjected to idiocincratic imperative devised to satisfy needs which do not relate to the inherent nature of the instructional process.[55]

Self-evaluation strategies must also be viewed in the light of the aforesaid, namely a device to enable teachers to influence the countenance of the evaluation. Although an abundance of self-evaluation devices are available, their established value resides more in the area of self-improvement than in the field of evaluation. The reason for this reaches into the threshold of evaluation theory. Many theoreticians and practicioners adhere to Scriven's Goal-free Evaluation concept, which espouses the idea that effects are not always related to goals, or objectives as originally perceived in a cause-effect relationship.[56] Therefore, an evaluation plan must concentrate on the effects. Most self-assessment instruments and strategies are built on a contractual premise, namely an assessment how well was a preconceived plan followed irrespective of the results. From this point of view, self-evaluation strategies and product centered or effect centered assessment may, if not handled with caution and empathy, send conflicting signals, which could, under adverse

---

54) *Salt Lake City School District, "Basic Policies", in Zapulla (Ed.), Ibid pp 165-181*

55) *Gary Natriello and Sanford Dornbusch "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals" Administrator's Notebook, The University of Chicago, Vol. XXIX:6 1981 in the same article the researchers summarize findings which indicate that teacher support and satisfaction is also related to the frequency of communication, agreement on evaluation criteria and an adequate sampling process.*

56) *Scriven Michael, "Goal Free Evaluation" School Evaluation: The Politics and Process, Berkley, California, McCutchan, 1973*

circumstances, undermine the entire evaluation enterprise.[57]

In the final analysis, the teacher should act as self-evaluator only when the self-evaluation process is designed to 1) enhance instructional quality 2) monitor a previously agreed upon instructional schedule.

Finally, a word about students and school patrons (parents) as evaluators must be uttered, not because of their undisputed importance to the evaluation process, which has never been established, but because of the hortative advice by "experts" to resort to parent and students evaluations, and the frequent translation of this advice into practice.[58] As can be gleaned from a large body of literature, student and parent evaluations are more closely associated with the notion of sharing the accomplishments of the schools with their public than their positive effect on the quality of instruction. The necessity of a close and mutually enhancing relationship between the schools and their publics is not a matter of dispute. The question is raised if such a relationship can be promoted by bringing the public and students into the evaluation process.

As mentioned earlier, the evaluation process for teachers is primarily designed to improve the quality of instruction. With all the ambiguities about the cause and effect relationships in the instructional process, the role of lay publics as evaluators must be cautiously defined and monitored with deference to their impact on instructional quality. The public relations needs should be treated as a separate

---

57) Lloyd E. McCleary, "Evaluation of Principals", Unpublished Paper, University of Utah
Peterson and Kauchak Ibid. These researchers, like many others, strongly support Scriven's Goal-Free evaluation principles failing to analyse, however the potential conflict between this approach and self-evaluative strategies. Peterson and Kauchak believe that the teacher should be allowed to make the best possible case for him/herself, the strength of which should be determined by outside evaluators, not unlike evaluations conducted presently in many institutions of higher learning. This writer challenges their ideas on the premise that effective personnel evaluation plans should be constructed to avoid surprises or the unknown. One of the central points which is made in this writing is the need of shared responsibility for an effective evaluation design, which contradicts an approach that says 'make your case first and we will tell you how good it is later'.

58) ERS Report, Evaluatin Teacher Competence Ibid. pp. 47-75 should be viewed as merely an example how parent and student evaluations are used in different situations without a valid link to the instructional process.

entity.[59]

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has been addressed to the evaluation of teachers. Naturally, an effective school organization requires a total evaluation plan for all school personnel. The evaluation complexities for non-teaching personnel are even at a lower level of exploration. Their ambiguities are so large that the subject cannot be included in this paper. At this point, little more can be done than to negotiate with non-teaching personnel performance based contracts grounded primarily in common sense premises as a stop-gap measure.

The evaluation of teachers can be implemented with more sophistication because more knowledge on this subject is available. Stipulating adequate financing and sufficient time teacher evaluation plans should focus on five aspects of teaching; 1) Teacher background and organizational skills 2) Communication ability 3) Classroom product in the form of achievement 4) Ability to instigate meaningful and focused work in the classroom and 5) use of those affective components which reinforce teaching effectiveness.

The development of assessment strategies is within reach although plans of implementation can only be tentative, subject to review and improvement with the accumulation of knowledge.

In the first place teachers new to the profession should be subjected to state and/or local entrance examination based on pedagogical knowledge, mastery of basic skills and mastery of specialization. Available tools, such as those developed by NTE should be tried. But in most likelihood, additional methods will have to be devised at state and/or local levels to satisfy specific expectations. Both theoretical and practical expertise will have to come under scrutiny before a teaching license is granted.

---

59) Thomas in Zapulla, Ibid. p. 64 counts "public relations" as a distinct performance evaluation criterion of teacher assessment which is separate from the instructional situation. Thomas and many others belong to the public relations school of thought which prescribes techniques aimed to achieve harmony between local schools and their patrons. Whereas such approaches have been proven effective at the local levels, the broader manifestations of public opinion which lead to periodically sweeping criticisms of education, such as A Nation at Risk, have not been addressed. The more we understand the mechanisms of public opinion the more pointed will the evaluation of public relations skills become.

After the initiation stage formative evaluations should be conducted on a yearly basis. Summative evaluations which may lead to promotion should rely on adequate sampling of work, which may extend over a number of years.

Evaluation can be implemented only after clear statements of goals, which, in the light of the nature of schools, must be related to instruction. Numerous instruments based on observation and post factum reporting techniques are available, but they must be carefully scrutinized and adapted if not specifically constructed to meet local/state needs. The instruments and techniques used should measure three basic features related to instruction: teaching universals, local conditions and specific local priorities. These should reach a degree of stability after some experimentation. Boards of education should avoid multiplicity and changeability of goals which can obscure the basic teaching-learning responsibility of schooling.

Most importantly, evaluation schemas must fit the overall organizational constraints of schools both in time impositions and financial burdens. The lack of practical realism of evaluation programs, mostly devised by institutions of higher learning, is one of their major weaknesses.

Successful implementation of evaluation plans requires special training for those who are involved in the process. Most teacher evaluators do not have such training. Successful teaching experience alone is not enough. These remarks are particularly cogent in the event a district plans the introduction of master teachers who will train and evaluate other teachers. Currently used methods to determine teaching effectiveness do not suffice to identify professionals for this stage.

The principles of a successful evaluation plan rest on full cooperation and participation of all parties who have a meaningful contribution potential to the improvement of the instructional process. This participation begins at the planning stage and continues through the implementations stages. Most crucial is the participation of the teaching community itself. The participation of administrative and supervisory personnel as well as the teachers themselves should follow defined guidelines. Lay personnel (parents-students) should only be involved to the degree it can be logically determined that their contributions enhance the quality of the instructional program.

And finally, an evaluation program will succeed if it takes the form of a contractual agreement based on a developed communication network.

In the light of the aforesaid the following recommendations are made:

1) provide means to form at the local levels evaluation planning committees composed of community and professional representatives to establish general goals.

2) Establish professional committees at the local levels to translate the goals into operational evaluation terminologies for every instructional field at all levels by identifying available tools and stratigies as well as areas which require further development.

3) Engage professional task forces to develop evaluation techniques and tools in the areas where they are not available.

4) Train evaluation personnel in the techniques of personnel evaluation.

5) Assign a district wide committee of teachers, administrators and board members (and other professional advisors as needed) to translate specific accomplishments as determined by agreed evaluation stratigies into merit pay and promotion terminology.

6) Monitor the plan for three years using both formative and summative strategies. At the end of this period, prepare a revised version.

In conclusion it must be remembered that some of the most impressive evaluation models have mostly remained in their blue print stages. The most brilliant plans have come to nought in the absence of fertile soil to grow on. Perhaps for the first time in the history of American education are conditions propitious for the development of educational personnel evaluation strategies with the convergence of public determination to improve public education coated with the will to provide it with life giving human and material energy.

A TEACHER EVALUATION PLAN - A STATE OF THE ART PERCEPTION

AREA	METHOD	AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUMENTS	EVALUATORS PARTICIPANTS	TIME FRAME STAGE	NEED
Teacher preparation	Summative evaluation written tests and field observations measuring universals, local expectations, specific skills	NTE and other locally used instruments	Supervisors, administrators, peers	Within the first two years prior to certification	Select, adapt and prepare instruments and methods
Organizational Skills	Formative and summative post factum descriptions and observations	Numerous commercial instruments and locally prepared instruments	Supervisors, peers, administrators, self. (Students and parents only when positive effect on instruction can be determined)	Formative every school year. Summative up to every three years or when sufficient sampling is obtained	Determine policies, strategies, definitions and translating them into locally operational terms
Communication Skills	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same
Scholastic Achievement	Summative	Standard and locally devised	Educational professionals	Yearly until adequate sampling is obtained	Contractual specificity
Time on Task	Formative and Summative. Field observations	Commercially and locally devised	Professionals	Yearly until adequate sampling is obtained	Definitions, methods, research, instruments suiting needs
Affective Skills	Must be subsumed in the above after determining their relevance - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -				Careful preparation of measuring strategies
Master Teacher	Summative	None	Professionals	Open	Identification of skills and methods to measure them

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

1) Adequate funding
2) Adequate human resources
3) Universal participation, including educators and their clients at the policy making levels
4) Technical work to be performed by professionals only
5) An expanded communication (feed-back) network
6) A training program for specific evaluation roles

REFERENCES

AASA Critical Issues Report, Staff Dismissal, American Association of School Administrators, 1978, p. 25

Edward Allen, "A Study of the Relationship of Teacher Enthusiasm to Salient Selected Variables Influencing Achievement in th Vocational Laboratory", Temple University, Penn. Dec 1979

Bagford, Jack, "Evaluating Teachers on Reading Instruction", Reading Teachers, Jan 1981 pp. 400-04

Larry W. Barber and Karen Klein, "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation" Phi Delta Kappan Dec 1983, pp. 247-251

Russel S. Beeher, "Staff Evaluation: The Essential Admistrative Task", Phi Delta Kappan, March 1979, 515-17

Dianne Blackmer, and others, "School Improvement Model Teacher Performance Criteria With Response, Modes and Standards. A Report", Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Aimes, IA 1981

Boris Blai, "Faculty Perceptions of Effictive Teachers: A Parallel-Perceptions Inquiry" Harcum Junior College, PA 1982

D. Bolton, "The Bases for Evaluating Teaching: Philosophy, Context and Purpose" in Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching, Gephart et al (Eds), Phi Delta Kappan, 1979

Larry A. Braskamp "What Research Says About Teaching" in Observation and the Evaluation of Teaching, Phi Delta Kappan, Willard Duckett (Ed) 1980

Casteter, William, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration, second edition, MacMillan Publishing Company 1976

Chapman, David and Sigrid Hutchison "Attrition for Teaching Careers: A Discriminant Analysis" American Educational Research Journal

Coker, Joan and Homer, Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectoveness Research, Georgia State University, 1982

Crews, Carol, "Rush to Judgement, No Time for Teacher Evaluation? Make Time" NASSP Bulletin, Feb 1981, pp. 12-16

Dade County Public Schools, Bureau of Staff Development, "Teacher Assessment and Development System (TADS)", Letter to Dr. Lewy, November 16, 1983

Denton, Jon et al, "Relations Among Final Supervisors' Skill Rating of Student Teachers and Cognitive Attainment Values of Learners Taught by Student Teachers" Paper Presented at Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin Feb 11-12, 1982

REFERENCES

Jon Denton et al,"Academic Characteristics of Student Teachers and Cognitive Attainment of their Learners" Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Dallas, Feb 17, 1981

Jon Denton et al, "An Evaluation Design to Examine the Instructional Effects of Classroom Teachers" Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Sep-Oct 1980, pp. 517

Jon Denton and Sherrill Norris, "Cognitive Attainment of Learners of Student Teachers: A Criterion for Attaining an Accountable Teacher Preparation Program", Texas A & M University 1979

Education Daily, Nov 23, 1983 pp. 1-2

Education Week "Teachers Evaluate Teachers in Unusual Project in Toledo" October 27, 1982

ERS Bulletin, April 1982

Joseph Ferreira, "The Role of the Supervisor in Teacher Evaluation" Phi Delta Kappan, May 1981 pp. 671-2

Flanders, Ned A., Analysing Teaching Behavior, Reading, MA Addison Wesley Publishing Co. 1970

Flately, Mary, "Do Better Teachers Have Better Interpersonal Skills" Business Education Forum, Oct 1980, 11-12

Garawski, Robert, "Successful Teacher Evaluation Not A Myth", NASSP Bulletin March 1980, pp. 1-7

Haertel Geneva and Harriet Talmage "Parents, Teachers and Evaluators: A Partnership to Enhance Home and School Learning Environments" Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, San Francisco 1979

Frederick H. Genk and Allen Klingberg, Effective Schools Through Effective Management, Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978

Mary Gleason, Teacher Supervision: Helping Principals Apply the School and Classroom Effectiveness Findings, OSSC Bulletin, March 1983

William, Goldstein, Supervision Made Simple, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, fastback, Bloomington, IN 1982

John I. Goodlad, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw Hill, 1984, pp. 101-105

Gray, J. et al, "Formal or Informal? Reassessment of the British Evidence", British Journal of Educational Psychology, June 1981

Hatti, John et al, "Student Teacher Performance by Supervising Teachers" Jounal of Educational Psychology, Oct 1982 pp. 778-85

REFERENCES

Robert C. Hawley, "Assessing Teacher Performance" Education Research Associates, Amherst, Mass. 1982, p. 9

Robert C. Hawley, Evaluating Teaching: A Handbook of Positive Approaches, ERA, Education Research Associates, 1982.

Joan P. Sullivan Kovalski, Evaluating Teacher Performance, Educational Research Service Inc., 1979

Lambeth, C, R., "Teacher Invitations and Effectiveness" Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, CA 1981

Lutz, J. P. et al, "Looking Forward by Looking Backward", Phi Delta Kappan, Feb 1983 pp. 430-432

Robert A. Martin, "Implications of Selected Supervisory Techniques for Success of Beginning Teachers of Agriculture", Pennsylvania State University, Sept 20, 1980. Unpublished paper.

Lloyd E. McCleary, "Evaluation of Principals", Unpublished Paper, University of Utah

Lloyd E. McCleary, "Administrator Evaluation: Concerns for the Practitioner" in Elio Zappulla Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, Starr Publishing Company, 1983

McGreal, Thomas, "Developing a Teacher Evaluation System: Communalities of those Systems that Function Most Effectively", Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Curriculum and Supervision, CA 1982

Natriello, Gary, "The Impact of the Evaluation of Teaching On Teacher Effort and Effectiveness, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, NY March 1982

Gary Natriello and Sanford Dornbusch, "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals" Administrator's Notebook, The University of Chicago, Vol. XXIX:6 1981

Ken Peterson and Don Kauchack, "Progress on Development of Lines of Evidence for the Evaluation of Public School Teaching", Paper Presented at the American Research Association, Montreal, April 1983

Phillip Schlechty and Victor Vance, Research on Teaching Implication for Practice, Recruitment Selection and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force, U.S. Department of Eduation, A National Invitational Conference, Feb 25-27, 1982

Scriven, Michael, "Goal Free Evaluation" School Evaluation: The Politics and Process, Berkley, CA, McCutchan, 1973

Lyle Smith and others, "A Low Inference Indicator of Lesson Structure in Mathematics" ERIC ED 207856, 1981

REFERENCES

Jane Stallings et al, "How to Change the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools" Department of Health, Education and Welfare, May 1979

State Department of Education, Hartford, CT, "Connecticut's Evaluation Law - Teacher Evaluation in Connecticut", in Zappulla, pp. 133-7

Daniel L. Stufflebeam and William J. Webster, "An Analysis of Alternative Approaches to Evaluation" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, May-June 1980, pp. 5-21

Strather, Marlene, "Accountability in the Classroom: How Teachers Evaluate" NASSP Bulletin, Mar 1980, pp. 16-20

M. Donald Thomas, "Performance Evaluation" in Zappula (Ed), Evaluating Administrative Performance, p. 64

Cindy Tursman, Good Teachers: What to Look For, National School Public Relations Association 1981, pp. 86-87

Walker, R. Scott, "The School Improvement Model: Tailoring A Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation System to Meet the Needs of the School Organization", Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn. 1982

David Weller, "Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments: A 'PERSONALIZED' Approach to Staff Development", Paper Presented at the National Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Phoenis, AZ, Feb 1982